

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 17 and 20 are amended. In particular, independent claim 1 is amended to recite, "determining if color misregistration has occurred by comparing the detected color value with the combined color value." Support for the amendment to independent claim 1 can be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0038] and [0053], for example. Independent claims 8 and 20 are amended similarly to independent claim 1. No new matter is added.

The Advisory Action maintains the rejections from the October 4, 2007 Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103. In particular, the Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Castelli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,221) in view of Hubble et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,918); claims 6 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Castelli in view of Hubble and further in view of Uchida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,816,844). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, Applicants assert that Castelli, Hubble and Uchida, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least determining if color misregistration has occurred by comparing the detected color value with the combined color value, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 8 and 20.

The Advisory Action asserts that Castelli discloses determining if color misregistration has occurred based on a detected color value detected by the spectrophotometric analysis of the registration path. The Office Action admits that Castelli incorporates the MOB sensor of De Jong, and further asserts that such an implementation entails "measuring the color values in terms of wavelength to distinguish between cyan, magenta, yellow and black." Thus, the Office Action asserts that while Castelli does measure registration error based on timing, Castelli also must detect the color values using RGB filters.

While Applicants dispute the Advisory Action's above-mentioned assertion, Applicants have amended the independent claims in order to expedite prosecution of this application. Specifically, while the Office Action may assert that Castelli discloses measuring color values, nowhere in the specification does Castelli disclose or suggest determining if color misregistration has occurred by comparing the detected color value with the combined color value. That is, Castelli never compares two color values to determine if color misregistration has occurred. Instead, as discussed in previous amendments, Castelli merely discloses detecting if misregistration has occurred by using the chevron mark technology and bi-cell detectors such as those disclosed in De Jong. Thus, Castelli determines if misregistration has occurred by comparing timing patterns of the photo diodes. Accordingly, even if the Advisory Action asserts that Castelli must detect color values using RGB filters, Castelli does not disclose or suggest determining if color misregistration has occurred by comparing the detected color value with the combined color value, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 8 and 20.

The Advisory Action admits that Hubble appears to disclose that the application of Hubble's spectrophotometer applies in terms of color correction and not color misregistration. However, the Advisory Action also asserts that Hubble discloses that "the novel concept is not limited to color correction" and cites col. 4, rows 58-64. However, Applicants respectfully submit that in this passage, Hubble merely discloses that "this patent application is not related to or limited to any particular one of the various possible algorithms or mathematical techniques for processing the electronic signals from the spectrophotometer to generate color correction ..." (emphasis added). Thus, Hubble merely discloses that this patent may be directed to different algorithms for generating color correction, not that the novel concept may be used beyond color correction, as asserted by the Advisory Action.

Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully submit that Hubble does not disclose or suggest determining if color misregistration has occurred by comparing the detected color value with the combined color value because, Hubble does not at all disclose or suggest performing color misregistration. While the Advisory Action may assert that Hubble is not limited only to color correction, which the Applicants dispute for the above-mentioned reasons, Hubble clearly does not disclose or suggest any methods of performing color misregistration, let alone determining if color misregistration has occurred by comparing the detected color value with the combined color value, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 8 and 20.


Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Uchida does not make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Castelli and Hubble. Uchida is merely relied upon by the October 4, 2007 Office Action for an alleged teaching or disclosure of a registration patch with a line perpendicular to a direction of color misregistration. However, Uchida does not disclose or suggest determining if color misregistration has occurred by comparing the detected color value and the combined color value.

In view of the above, Castelli, Hubble and Uchida, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 20, which are therefore allowable. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and claims 9-19 depend from claim 8, and are therefore also allowable by virtue of their dependency as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John S. Kern
Registration No. 42,719

JAO:DCT/jth

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 4, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--